

Chief Judge Ricardo S. Martinez

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROLANDO ESPINDOLA HERNANDEZ,

Defendant.

NO. CR20-120RSM

ORDER CONTINUING TRIAL

This matter comes before the Court on the stipulated motion of the government and defendant Rolando Espindola Hernandez to continue the trial in this matter, and to set a new pretrial motion cutoff consistent with the trial date set for other arraigned defendants. Having considered the motion, any responses and objections, and all the files and records herein, the Court finds and rules as follows:

The facts supporting continuing the trial and excluding the consequent delay are set forth in the Stipulated Motion to Continue, incorporated by this reference, and include the following: (a) the number of defendants charged; (b) the already large number of charged counts; (c) the nature of the prosecution, which includes a long-running investigation into a complex multi-state and multi-national money laundering scheme; and (d) the extensive volume of discovery produced, and still to be produced, including extensive financial records.

ORDER CONTINUING TRIAL

United States v. Espindola Hernandez / CR20-120RSM - 1

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
700 STEWART STREET, SUITE 5220
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101
(206) 553-7970

1 THIS COURT FINDS, pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section
 2 3161(h)(7)(B)(i) and (ii) that this case is the case is sufficiently unusual and complex, due
 3 the combination of the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, as well as the
 4 existence of novel questions of fact, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation
 5 by the parties for pretrial proceedings or for the trial itself by the current trial date, or for
 6 the immediate future.

7 THE COURT THEREFORE FINDS that failure to grant the continuance in this
 8 case would likely make the continuation of these related proceedings impossible and
 9 result in a miscarriage of justice, because failing to continue this matter for a considerable
 10 period of time would deny counsel for the parties the reasonable time necessary for
 11 effective preparation, due to defense counsels' need for more time to review the
 12 considerable volume of discovery and evidence produced, and still to be produced, and to
 13 consider possible defenses and motions, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

14 THE COURT FINDS, in light of these factors, that it is unlikely that the parties
 15 can be reasonably ready to try this matter before January of 2023, at the earliest.

16 THIS COURT FINDS, pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section
 17 3161(h)(6) and (7), that this is a reasonable period of delay in that the defendant has
 18 indicated they require more time to prepare for trial. The Court finds that given the
 19 complexity of the case, the number of defendants, and the volume of discovery produced,
 20 and still to be produced, that more time is, in fact, necessary.

21 THIS COURT FINDS, therefore, that pursuant to Title 18, United States Code,
 22 Sections 3161(h)(6) and 3161(h)(7), the ends of justice will best be served by a
 23 continuance, and that they outweigh the interests of the public and the defendant in a
 24 speedy trial.

25 THIS COURT FURTHER FINDS that all of the additional time requested
 26 between the current trial date of and the new trial date of January 23, 2023, is necessary
 27 to provide counsel for the defendants the reasonable time necessary to prepare for trial.
 28

1 THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that while additional defendants have yet to
2 appear, those defendants will almost certainly need additional time to prepare for trial as
3 well. In any event, it is well established that in multi-defendant cases, a reasonable trial
4 continuance as to any defendant tolls the Speedy Trial Act period as to all joined co-
5 defendants, even those who object to a trial continuance or who refuse to submit a waiver
6 under the Speedy Trial Act. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(6).

7 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the trial date will be
8 continued as to Rolando Espindola Hernandez in the case captioned above until January
9 23, 2023 at 9:00 a.m.

10 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that pretrial motions will be filed no later than
11 December 1, 2022.

12 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the time between this date and the new trial date
13 is excluded in computing the time within which a trial must be held pursuant to Title 18,
14 United States Code, Section 3161, et seq.

15
16 DATED this 1st day of July, 2022.

17
18
19 

20 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
21 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22
23

24 Presented by:
25 NICHOLAS W. BROWN
26 United States Attorney

27 /s/ Vincent T. Lombardi
28 VINCENT T. LOMBARDI
Assistant United States Attorney